

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets makes changes to Figs. 4 and 4a and replace the original sheets with Figs. 4, 4a, and 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 8 have been allowed. By this Amendment, independent claim 10 is amended; new claim 19 is added; the specification is amended; and the drawings are amended. The specification is amended for clarity. Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 can be found, at least, within paragraph [0066] of the pre-grant application publication. Support for new claim 19 can be found, at least, within previously presented claims 10 and 18. Support for the amendments to Figs. 4 and 4a can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0061] - [0077] of the pre-grant application publication. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 11 and 18 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claim 7 would be allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome. Because the rejection is overcome for the reasons described below, claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

II. Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification for alleged informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection.

By this Amendment, the specification is amended such that Applicant respectfully submits that it meets all formal requirements.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

III. Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) and 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Applicant respectfully traverses the objection.

By this Amendment, Figs. 4 and 4a are amended responsive to the objections such that Applicant respectfully submits that they meet all formal requirements.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 7 and 16 are not indefinite. Specifically, the fact that a noise burst could possibly be of indefinite length does not render the claim language indefinite. A mere possibility does not render a claim indefinite. The language of dependent claims 7 and 16 is clear such that one skilled in the art would understand (1) the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention and (2) the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Yonemitsu (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,779). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yonemitsu fail to disclose, at least, an error correction method including copying each data symbol that is to be transmitted alternately onto two or more of a plurality of registers, as recited by independent claim 10.

Specifically, the Office Action asserts at page 6 that "Yonemitsu's transfer of the input data through an EDC adding circuit 127 and a sector adding circuit 128 necessarily involves 'copying each data symbol that is to be transmitted onto a register.'" However, by this Amendment, independent claim 10 is amended to recite "copying each data symbol that is to be transmitted alternately onto two or more of a plurality of registers." As is clear from the

disclosure of Yonemitsu, there is no disclosure of nor is it necessary or inherent that data is copied alternatively onto two or more of a plurality of registers.

Accordingly, Yonemitsu fails to disclose each and every element of independent claim 10. Therefore, independent claim 10 is patentable. The dependent claims are also patentable, at least, by virtue of their dependencies from patentable independent claim 10, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

VI. New Independent Claim 19

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 19 is allowable, at least, for the reasons that dependent claim 18 contains allowable subject matter.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



John S. Kern

Registration No. 42,719

Kevin Ross Davis

Registration No. 64,667

JSK:KRD/plj

Attachment:

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Date: September 2, 2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. Box 320850

Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850

Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461